CANDOUR *The British Views-Letter*

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol 38, No 4. *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* April, 1987.

STAY FOR AN ANSWER

by ROSINE de BOUNEVIALLE

"'What is truth'? said jesting Pilate, and did not stay for an answer.

But at least Pilate knew there was something about life that called for an answer even though - with perhaps more excuse than we have - he shied away from its challenge. The troubles of "our proud and angry dust" stem from the arrogant conviction that we need no one to teach us anything. Ironic; in an age when school "masters" have become "teachers", they are expected only to supervise while their scholars "do their own thing". "Indoctrination" is almost as dirty a word as "proselytise". Man forbid either!

For decades - for centuries even - our usurping liberal-humanist mentors have tried, and to too large an extent have succeeded, in keeping "the people" in chaotic rather than blissful ignorance of the reality of the personification of objective Truth, rejected by place-seeking Pilate, betrayed by Judas Iscariot in a gluttony of pride, and condemned for expediency's sake by the High Priest in defiance of his own court's laws of evidence. Once this mainspring is concealed or denied, the streams of all truth become vehicles for the pollution emitted by the manufactories of lies, until the murky waters poison every unsuspecting victim who drinks from them.

Without A Glimmer

Unsuspecting is the operative word. Few people under fifty years old now have been truly instructed in the workings of the Christian faith - the leaven in the dough that usury had made of the glories and grandeurs of the ancient world. In the adulterated minds of nineteenth century students, the "Dark Ages" stretched without a glimmer from Rome to the "Renaissance".

However, if you can't keep a good man down, as they say, it eventually becomes equally "impossible", as noted by F.M.S. in a pre-1939 **Britannica**, "for historians to dismiss one of the great constructive periods in human activity with an epithet implying contempt for its achievements and the phrase has now become obsolete [our italics]." Oh, don't we wish it had! The encyclopaedia continues: "It remains, nevertheless, the fact that the six centuries following the collapse of the Roman Empire are in an especial sense dark through the insufficiency of historical evidence [suppose they couldn't find any gas chambers!]. Even so it is necessary to remember that intellectual work of the highest quality was done by exceptional individuals in ages when life was insecure and environment very discouraging to thought."

How is that for a thorough-going piece of inconsistency? Unless the confusion was intentional, one wonders how F.M.S. was considered intellectually worthy of encyclopaedic inclusion. "Life was insecure and environment discouraging to thought," he says, writing of a time that saw the rise and reign of Charles the Great.

Strange how we are happy to accept the concept of umpteen million years of undisturbed security of environment enabling (so we are taught) the jelly in the mud to evolve into homo sapiens, but we cannot even imagine what appropriately secure life and encouraging environment allowed "one of the great constructive periods in human activity" to develop. This, in a country where every surviving cathedral, enduring cottage, ruined monastery and ancient chapel by field or coppice speaks more eloquently than any muddled scholar of the happy, God-loving, industrious, creative society flowering on the Christian root and stem cultivated in the ages so cavalierly dismissed as "Dark" by generations who have shut out more of the Light essential for spiritual growth than any other.

Still, our excuse must be that we were not so addicted to tourism in the nineteenth century. But now we are. So what do those trampling thousands think about whilst they are making untenable where most they satisfy their visiting lust? Have those monasterial ruins in the Stately Home's back garden no significance for them? Were those eleventh century chapels built in the fields for sheep to worship in? Did those miracles of mediaeval architecture erupt like volcanoes, throwing pillars and arches instead of lava into the sky?

W.A.S.P. Mythology

Whence came the veneration in which the first Elizabeth is held? Doubtless from the same manipulators who lowered the safety curtain on the last of the Plantagenets, leaving the whole mediaeval scene to make a feast for fiction writers. For three hundred years, White Anglo-Saxon Protestants were regaled with tales of torture, slavery and corruption endemic in the priest-ridden society in which the poor were turned away to starve whilst the monks fornicated with the nuns and both sucked up the fat of the land.

The truth, after all, was of no consequence to anyone but persecuted papists, and would have been a positive detriment to the careers of those usurers and usurpers who, but for one brief interlude, have bedevilled our land ever since. So we have instead the myth of Gloriana and a Golden Age; a land rescued from ignorance and superstition; free from the thrall of priestly idolators and cruel bigots. Good, white Queen Bess, returning blackamoors to America whence they had been brought in the second instance (not returned to Africa whence they were brought in the first instance, note). Good, merciful Queen Bess, lacking a secret assassin, claiming she was tricked by a pragmatic politician into signing the death warrant of her "sister-Queen" of Scots - who was also the legitimate heir to the English throne. The Virgin Queen, who complained she "was but barren stock". The English Queen, whose sailors brought her treasure from the Indies (property of Spain) whilst her poor subjects could drop starving in the gutters because the "new rich" had gutted the looted monasteries and "massing" priests and all who harboured them were hung, drawn and quartered. They were dead and there was no charity anymore. And soon there was little faith either, but Elizabeth still reigns even in nationalist hearts as the one with "the body of a weak woman" who conquered Spain.

James I is now the much quoted darling of A.S.H. as he was the first to inveigh against the vileness of tobacco. Charles I had a papist wife and trespassed in the House of Commons, so he deserved to die even if he was noble about it. The regicide failed to found a Cromwellian dynasty but he certainly invited the return of that dynasty of money-

lenders so summarily dismissed in an age now again designated "Dark". Charles II, returned by popular demand, temporarily outwitted the baying hounds of democracy and died a very natural death, so he is now remembered only for dogs and debauchery.

James II advocated religious tolerance for himself as well as for his subjects, so outraged Democracy proved what a mistake that was by banishing him from both his rightful inheritance and from any hope of objective assessment of his character and career. He is the Hitler of English "history", only defeated before he could do the same harm. Even the Catholics cannot like him! After that, Democracy never looked back. Through rebellions and revolutions, bubbles and bombs, the Bank of England was the rock on which the National Debt was founded. Even those who still listened to The Word listened with but half an ear, the other half cocked for the shibboleth. Not The Word, but the password opens the gates to the kingdom of this world - One World.

The Learned And The Conned

For a moment after 1918 it looked as if we were staying for the answer this time. But no, the Elders "went among the people" and they were soon clamouring for the release of Barabbas and Company although no one was standing in the way of their departure. Commonsense might have told us that - but there is nothing like wars or rumours of wars to suspend the exercise of any sense, let alone the rarest variety; and when the war is total, so is the suspension. So we are conned, and conned again. By 1944, we believed in unconditional surrender. By 1945, we believed in "Science" to bring it about. By 1947, we did not even know who had made the unconditional surrender. By 1987, the evidence is as strong and true as the gothic arches - and as silent. The defeated murder their own offspring, adulterate their own race, debauch their own bodies, and damn their own souls.

So now we know. The Word silently submits to the scourge. If we would hear It again, we must go humbly to the foot of the Cross, search through the bones and blood to the empty tomb. If we cannot believe the Truth is still with us through the Resurrection, we shall end by believing in the Holocaust through Zyklon-B. And, in vulgar parlance, you cannot get more conned than that!

WINSTON: THE BORN LOSER

"Winston Churchill was saved from becoming a pauper by U.S. financier Bernard Baruch when he lost heavily on the Stock Market in 1929, an historian says in **American Heritage** magazine. Churchill dropped into Baruch's office and decided to play the market, and as prices tumbled he plunged deeper and deeper, trying to out-guess the Stock Exchange.

"At the end of the day, he confronted Baruch in tears, wrote historian William Manchester. Churchill said he would have to sell everything, including his country estate, and drop out of politics to enter business to recoup his losses. But he had lost nothing, according to the article. Baruch, who called Churchill 'a born losing gambler', had left instructions to buy equivalent stocks every time Churchill sold his, and to sell whenever Churchill bought. 'Winston had come out exactly even because, he later learned, Baruch even paid the commissions,' said Manchester."

- **Sunderland Echo**, January 27th.

CUT AND THRUST

by JANUS

Once more it has been demonstrated how useless and even idiotic it is to vote for the bulk of the current and potential Members of Parliament. Nobody has any doubt about what the majority (still) of the population of England wants in respect of the punishment for murderers and malefactors. Yet their representatives are determined to vote on their own consciences, or in accordance with EEC "law", but not, repeat not, as spokesmen of the people who voted for them. Predictably, liberals of every party slung every epithet conceivable at the minority of MPs man enough to wish that monsters like Silcott or Hindley receive condign punishment. I am forced to conclude that the jelly-fish creatures who desire to preserve such worthless lives are a nightmare symptom of the morbidity at present gnawing into our society. In a way, morally they are in part responsible for the appalling murders that we witness.

* * * *

Germany has been ordered to lift its laws on the making of beer, which for four centuries have restricted the ingredients to water, malt, hops and yeast and nothing else. From now on other countries, notably France and Belgium, I understand, can sell their rather more doubtful products in Germany. Similarly, there is widespread doubt in Britain over the safety of "irradiated" foods; the experts say that they are harmless but others hold that it is impossible to be sure. In any event, it seems to me that we shall have no choice in the matter, again because of a decision by the EEC. How fortunate we are to be living in a free and democratic society and not in a dictatorship where we would have no say in our own affairs but have to take (and eat) what we are given.

* * * *

The **Diverse Reports** programme about the recently banned play, "Perdition", was compulsive viewing, not least for its assembly of five Jewish and one Gentile protagonists to battle out the issue. Voluble support for the play - which argues there was collaboration between Jews and Nazis in war-time Hungary to provide for the emigration of several thousand young Jews to Palestine - came from a Jewish anti-Zionist historian. Jim Allen, the playwright, described his work as constituting a lethal attack on Zionism because it touched at the heart of the Holocaust - what elsewhere he has argued to be "the most abiding myth of modern history". The antis also contended that the Zionists qua Zionists thought they should be ever immune from criticism on account of that. Predictably, a "survivor of Auschwitz" was there, being given the last word in deference to his survival status, which seems really rather commonplace nowadays. The **Telegraph** TV critic wondered why the playwright should want to "gouge open these wounds, except for ideological reasons". What are the reasons, pray, for the glut of plays, books and films sustaining the "abiding myth" of the Holocaust if not ideological?

* * * *

How is it, I wonder, that when discussions on the rights of women to do paid work through pregnancy take place on the odd **Women's Hour** programme I listen to, the effect of working conditions on the "developing

baby" is of first concern? Yet when the same programme discusses the rights of women in the abortion field, the "developing baby" becomes a "foetus", an anomalous excrescence to be disposed of at will. Perhaps we should be thankful that at least on occasion the truth has a way of reasserting itself and rejecting the camouflage of euphemism. Whatever, it has all come about by the insistence on the shrill and self-pitying demand for "women's rights" and the denial of rights in this matter to the "foetus". Unborn babies have rights, it seems, only if they are lucky enough to escape until squeamishness makes their destruction upsetting to us. Yet this obscures the principle of the matter, as Ronald Butt observed last month in **The Times**. If there is no moral distinction between the abortion of a viable child and infanticide, it must follow that there is equally no distinction between the abortion of a viable child and an earlier one to prevent the foetus reaching the threshold of viability. It is still the unforgivable destruction of an innocent human life.

* * * *

Equality is not enough in the eyes of lefty Lambeth Council. Job advertisements for the £16,000-a-year post of head of the borough's police unit seek applications "from black people only". Heading them is a forest of reproduced newspaper cuttings showing a clear anti-police theme. It seems to me the height of effrontery to demand that indigenous British people be discriminated against in their own country. But I haven't the slightest doubt that the Race Acts will not be invoked against the perpetrators of this outrageous nonsense, even though Mr. Newsam's race commissars are reported to be "considering" the case. Don't they realise that nothing could be more likely to create the very hatred that they profess to deplore?

* * * *

So Mrs. Thatcher can go at our expense to Moscow to talk to the faithful representative of a regime that boasts of dealing in lies and that remains terror-ridden and monstrous, glasnost notwithstanding. If the people of Britain really want to prop up the Communist regime in the USSR with largesse in the form of food, technology, loans, etc., then I wonder why do we provide ourselves with any of those things, thereby making competition for our friendly enemies?

C O N T R A S T S

"Without religion there can be no morality, and without morality there can be no law" - Lord Denning.

"The theatre can be a marvellous world, since God is dead and religion is dead" - Jean Littlewood (**Scottish Daily Express**, August 21st., 1964)

READ SPEARHEAD. Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the B.N.P. Send 63p for a sample copy to P.O. Box 446, London SE23 2LS.

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £5.00 OVERSEAS £6.00 AIRMAIL U.S. $10 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

LORD DENNING AND BRITISH SOVEREIGNTY

by A.M. WADE

Britain has fought in two World Wars in this century to defend its National Freedom and Sovereign Power. The people of the Falklands wished to remain under British Sovereignty and our present Government declared that the wishes of the people there must be respected at all costs. Self-determination was declared sacrosanct for the Falklanders, though few in number and difficult to defend. Parliamentary power under the Crown has been regarded as the supreme and unassailable right of the British Nation, to which we might add: "subject to the right of the British people to self-determination."

Yet Self-Determination NOT For Britain

While the attention of the media was on a trifling argument with the B.B.C., the deed was done. So far as one could see, virtually the only revelation of the deed came from Lord Denning in an article in **The Times** on November 3rd. of last year.

The Rt. Hon. Lord Denning, P.C., former Master of the Rolls, revealed the astounding fact that the Crown and Parliament no longer hold supreme power over the Nation. This now lies with the Council of Ministers in Europe. At present they hold a total voting power of 76, of which we possess 12. Where our preferences lie in all spheres of life, if they differ from the consensus in the Council we can be compelled to bow the knee, as in fact we have already had to do in the case of the allegedly obscene dolls, rejected by our Customs officers. The country was bamboozled over the referendum about joining the Common Market. Was it clearly explained to the people that acceptance of the Treaty of Rome involved the ending of national independence and the subordination of Queen and Parliament to the wishes of a group of European nations? [No, because not one whisper or flash of the plot to destroy British sovereignty was uttered by the establishment-sponsored "anti"-Market campaign and media silence was ensured for the protests of the truly patriotic resistance. See 'Referendum Effrontery' in the May 1975 issue of **Candour** - Editor.]

Admittedly, many people were happy to co-operate with our European neighbours in many matters of mutual interest, but was it ever said that our Parliament, in national matters and Commonwealth arrangements and agreements was not free from their supervision and correction? Only a year ago the Lord Chancellor, Lord Hailsham, was reported as saying that Parliament was omnipotent (**Daily Telegraph**, April 4th., 1986).

Let Us Hear Lord Denning's Words

"For nearly 300 years our constitutional law has been based on the principle that Parliament was our supreme legislative authority. It alone could make, unmake or amend our laws. That sovereignty has now been ended. Its overthrow will be completed by Parliament itself today when it passes the European Communities (Amendment) Bill. It is called the Single European Act."

We learn from Lord Denning that great efforts had been made in the House of Lords to amend the Single European Act and so preserve the sovereignty of the Queen in Parliament. But Lord Gladwyn declared that if even one of the 53 amendments passed in the House of Lords was passed in Parliament, it would constitute a violation of the Treaty of

Rome and render our remaining in the Community impossible. So, may we not say that our birthright has been surrendered by stealth, without the people of this country understanding the seriousness of the situation now, and its implications for the future?

Lord Denning's concluding words, which should have been given maximum publicity, were: "Gone are the battles that have divided us in the past as each strove for mastery. Gone is the concept of national sovereignty - to be replaced by European unity. The bells are sounding, 'Ring out the old, ring in the new.' It is the beginning of an epoch. It is a vision come true. For Europe. I would therefore now for myself say: Let us forget the issues that divided us. Let us give the Single European Act our whole-hearted support." (**The Times**, November 3rd., 1986.)

In Douglas Jay's Footsteps?

Undoubtedly Lord Denning and his colleagues in the House of Lords did their best to preserve the sovereign rights and independence of our nation, but are now willing to accept this unprecedented fait accompli with good grace. [Echoes of "anti"-Marketeer Douglas Jay's admission in 1975 that he would accept the result of the Referendum regardless of the continuing treason a "yes" vote would entail - Editor.]

What was considered by Mrs. Thatcher's Government as unthinkable for the 1600 or so Falklanders has been done to our 50 million or whatever, without confession to the public with reasons made clear. Wing Commander Leonard Young has made a lifetime study of international affairs and offers these comments:

"The right of Parliament to make, unmake or amend our laws is limited by the requirement to comply with the terms of the Coronation Oath. The Single European Act utterly destroys the Coronation Oath and should therefore be opposed to the utmost as being illegal. Parliament has no power to pass such an Act and by so doing is guilty of High Treason."

It is ironical in the extreme that Northern Ireland is furious at the idea of a foreign power having some rights over them, while our Government accepts a minority position of 12 out of 76 and no audible objection has been heard.

Letter To The Editor

I feel I must reply to H.P.M.'s criticisms of my review of **Apartheid - Capitalism or Socialism.** I was quite explicit in saying that the views of the contributors might well not be agreeable. I only asked that those who took a different approach should produce a scenario "at least as well-founded in history and economic realism". A rigid colour bar, enforced by law, is not the only protection for the Whites against physical absorption. Most people of most races are naturally proud of their inheritance, and it is mainly when they are deprived artificially of their own heritage, or suitably educated partners of the opposite sex, that miscegenation becomes anything more than an embarassment to the offspring. Migrant labourers separated from their families have done far more to produce miscegenation than any free economy. If H.P.M. wants to prevent AIDS in southern Africa, he must recognise that civil war, anarchy and famine, accompanied as they invariably are by rape, are far more likely to do the damage than devising a federal system to enable all races to keep their traditions.

LESLIE GREENE

"YOU CAN DISCRIMINATE IF IT'S TEMPORARY" - OFFICIAL!

by DAVID MICHAEL, M.A.

Readers of **Candour** will be interested, I am sure, in a matter of some public importance concerning the modus operandi of the Commission for Racial Equality.

On Tuesday, February 24th., the Students' Union at Keele University segregated its facilities on racial grounds. Specifically, students possessing brown eyes were allocated superior facilities, and students with other-coloured eyes were obliged to use inferior facilities. The reason given for this by the Union was that it was similar to the kind of thing that occurs in South Africa.

Now, the Students' Union is supposed to be an organisation that represents all students irrespective of race (indeed, it has a policy of non-racism). However, in recent weeks it appears to have fallen into the hands of a group of ultra-leftists who, having forced the resignation of the previous president, are now proceeding to indulge in a variety of lunatic activities, such as closing the Union building as a protest against government policies, calling upon students to boycott lectures, and flooding the University with anti-South African posters and leaflets.

The segregation of the Union building was thus just one of many instances of leftist agitation here. Technically, the segregation constitutes a breach of the 1976 Race Relations Act. As a gesture of protest against Union policies, I therefore made a complaint to Peter Newsam, Chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality. I received a letter from him dismissing my complaint on the ground that the Union's decision was "a different matter" to making segregation a general feature of its arrangements.

The dismissal of my complaint is not in itself terribly important. The CRE has no obligation to act and can exercise its discretion on such matters so long as in exercising such discretion it does not itself break the law. However, the reason given by Newsam for not acting, namely that the discrimination was temporary and was a protest against apartheid, does have important implications.

Firstly, it has no foundation in law as far as I can discern. And this is understandable. If discriminating for one day to make a political point were legal, then all kinds of interesting cases could arise. A shopkeeper could designate his shop "whites only" for a day as a protest against coloured immigration. The CRE seems to be saying, with no regard to its charter, "You can discriminate so long as it is temporary and so long as it is to make a (left wing?) political point." I find this amazing.

Secondly, it is entirely arguable that Newsam is exercising his discretion in such a way that he is himself breaching the 1976 Race Relations Act. I rather get the impression that temporary discrimination by whites against blacks has prompted immediate action from the CRE in the past. That my complaint has been dismissed so brusquely can be attributed only to the fact that I do not have a black skin. I consider this to be outrageous.

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD, England (Editor: Rosine de Bounevialle).